arXiv:1303.3736v1 [hep-th] 15 Mar 2013

Fluid/Gravity Correspondence For General Non-rotating Black Holes

Xiaoning Wu[1,2,3], Yi Ling[5,3], Yu Tian[4,3] and Chengyong Zhang[4]
1. Institute of Mathematics, Academy of Mathematics and System Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
2. Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics, CAS, Beijing 100190, China
3. State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190
4. School of Physics, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China
5. Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the fluid/gravity correspondence in spacetime with general non-rotating weakly isolated horizon. With the help of Petrov-like boundary condition and large mean curvature limit, we show that the dual hydrodynamical system is described by a generalized forced incompressible Navier-Stokes equation. Specially, for stationary black holes or those spacetime with some asymptotically stationary conditions, such a system reduces to a standard forced Navier-Stocks system.

1 Introduction

The correspondence between gravity and fluid was found in 70's of last century. Damour[1] firstly noticed that there was a formal correspondence between the Raychaudury equations and fluid equations. He suggested that the black hole horizon could be viewed as a membrane of fluid. Such idea had been studied by other researchers[2] and this method was called "membrane paradigm of black hole"[3]. These work imply that there should be some relations between the gravitational perturbation of black hole horizon and the dynamics of fluid membrane.

More than twenty years later, such a topic has been reconsidered in the framework of AdS/CFT correspondence. Based on AdS/CFT correspondence, the gravity in bulk should be dual to some quantum field theory on the boundary of spacetime. Under certain conditions, any quantum field theory can be effectively described by hydrodynamics at the long wavelength limit. So there should be a natural correspondence between the dynamics of long wavelength gravitational perturbation and hydrodynamics. Such correspondence was firstly studied by Policastro, Son and Starinets [4]. They considered the hydrodynamics of super-symmetric gauge theory on the conformal boundary of spacetime and found the similar properties as found by Damour on black-hole horizon. Following this idea, many important works have been done and there is a nice review on this topic[5]. This so-called fluid/gravity duality were further deepened by Bhattacharyya et al to a full correspondence involving the nonlinear fluid dynamics[6]. The similarity between the fluid/gravity duality in the AdS/CFT framework and black-hole membrane indicates that there should be some relations between them. Indeed, this kind of universality is considered in [7], and is later interpreted as the Wilson renormalization group flow in the AdS/CFT framework[8]. Some further developments following this approach can be found in [9, 10, 11].

The membrane paradigm has been generalized to some asymptotic AdS black holes as well. Kovtun, Son and Starinets first found that long-time, long-distance fluctuations of plane-symmetric horizons exhibit universal hydrodynamic behavior[12]. Later, Eling, Oz and their colleagues (EO) found[13], with the non-relativistic limit and long wavelength limit, that the gravitational perturbation of black brane satisfies the Navier-Stocks equation. EO method is a quite nice way to establish the membrane paradigm of horizon because it is a local method which only requires the geometric information near horizon but do not need the knowledge of the asymptotic region. But this approach contains some drawbacks. As emphasized by them, the long wavelength limit plays a crucial role in this method, thus it can only be applicable to the spatially non-compacted case, typically in which the horizon is plane-symmetric. Some improvement has been made recently. In Ref.[14], Lysov and Strominger(LS) studied the fluid/gravity correspondence with the help of Petrov-like boundary condition in a flat spacetime. They found that, with the help of Petrov-like boundary condition and large mean curvature limit (which is equivalent to near horizon limit), the correspondence between Einstein equation and Navier-Stocks equation can be established. The main idea of their work is following. First, they consider the perturbations of the extrinsic curvature K_{ab} of a hyper-surface Σ_c and impose a Petrov-like boundary condition for Weyl curvature on Σ_c. Since the Weyl tensor is traceless, the Petrov-like boundary condition provides $\frac{p(p+1)}{2}-1$ constraints on the $\frac{(p+1)(p+2)}{2}$ components of K_{ab}. The Gaussian equation also gives another constrain equation for the perturbation of K_{ab}, so the remaining $p+1$ independent components of K_{ab} may be interpreted as the velocity field v^i and the pressure P of fluid living on this hypersurface. The Gaussian equation on Σ_c can be viewed as an equation of state for this fluid and the Codazzi equations on Σ_c will give the evolution equation of this fluid. Then taking a suitable non-relativistic limit and large mean curvature limit (near horizon limit), the Codazzi equations have the form of incompressible Navier-Stocks equations. In Ref.[9], Strominger and his colleague have shown that the long wave perturbation solution of gravity satisfies the Petrov-like boundary condition. This implies that we can use the Petrov-like boundary condition instead of long-wave condition to evade the difficulty of compactness of the hypersurface. Like EO's method, LS's method is also a local method in linking the Einstein equation and the Navier-Stocks equation. Since in this approach one only imposes Petrov type boundary condition and the near horizon limit rather than the long wavelength limit, the requirement of the spatial uncompactness for the hypersurface becomes unnecessary. Some generalizations of Strominger's work have been considered. Ref.[15, 16] generalized this framework to some curved cases and the cases with a cosmological constant, respectively. Ref.[17] further considered the situation of spacetime with electromagnetic field.

It is worthwhile to point out that, up to now the fluid/gravity correspondence in this route has only been investigated in some concrete background such as static black hole solutions in literature. However, based on the accumulated experience in the study of AdS/CFT, one has reasons to believe that such a correspondence should be a quite general notion. At least, it should be applicable to general stationary black holes, so a general proof for such correspondence in a more general setting is needed. This paper will focus on this topic. We will show that for any spacetime which contains a non-rotating weakly isolated horizon LS's realization of the fluid/gravity correspondence can always be established.

This paper is organized as following. In Sec.II, the definition of weakly isolated horizon is introduced and the near horizon geometry is studied. In Sec.III, we introduce the Petrov-like condition for gravity and analyze its detailed behavior under the near horizon limit. The equivalence between Strominger's large mean curvature limit and near horizon limit has been addressed and the Gaussian equation has also been considered in this section. In Sec.IV, we derive the incompressible Navier-Stokes equation from the Codazzi equation for gravity. Section V contains some discussions of our work.

2 The geometry near non-rotating isolated horizon

In order to consider the existence of fluid/gravity correspondence for general black hole, a general definition of black hole horizon is needed. The weakly isolated horizon (WIH) advocated by Ashtekar *et. al.* is a nice choice[18]. This sort of horizon preserves many important properties of traditional black hole horizon, but be applicable to more general cases. It has been shown that stationary black hole horizon are all WIH[18, 19]. Roughly speaking, WIH is a non-expansion light cone with almost stationary inner geometry. A nice review of WIH can be found in [18]. In ref.[19], Ashtekar's definition has been generalized to higher dimensional space-time. The definition of WIH in $(p+2)$-dimensional space-time is given as following[19].

Definition 1 *(Weakly Isolated Horizon in $(p+2)$-dimensional space-time)*
Let (M, g) be a $(p+2)$-dim Einstein manifold with or without a cosmological constant. $\mathcal{H}$ is a $(p+1)$-dim null hypersurface in M and l is the null normal of $\mathcal{H}$. $\mathcal{H}$ is called a weakly isolated horizon in M if
(1). there exists an embedding : $S \times [0,1] \to M$, $\mathcal{H}$ is the image of this map, S is a p-dimensional compact, connected manifold and for every maximal null curve in $\mathcal{H}$ there exists $x \in S$ such that the curve is the image of $x \times [0,1]$;
(2). the expansion of l vanishes everywhere on $\mathcal{H}$;
(3). $R_{ab}l^a l^b|_{\mathcal{H}} = 0$;
(4). let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the induced connection on $\mathcal{H}$, $[\mathcal{L}_l, \mathcal{D}]l = 0$ holds on $\mathcal{H}$.

To generalize fluid/gravity correspondence to WIH case, the geometry near horizon is needed. So in this section, we will get some control on the behavior of metric near horizon.

Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is a WIH in a $(p+2)$-dimensional spacetime, based on the definition of ref.[18, 19]. To control geometry near a null hypersurface, a Bondi-like coordinate system is always a convenient choice[20]. Let l be the tangent vector of null generator of $\mathcal{H}$ with parameter t. The level set of t in $\mathcal{H}$ gives a space-like foliation $\{S_t\}$ of $\mathcal{H}$. On section $t=0$, there are coordinates $\{x^i\}$. Generator of horizon will bring this coordinates to the whole horizon. On each section S_t, let $\{E_I\}$ be a set of orthonormal basis for the tangent space of S_t. Under some suitable rotation, $\{E_I\}$ can always be chosen such that $(\mathcal{L}_l E_I)|_{\mathcal{H}} \propto E_I$. Therefore, we have tetrad (l, E_I) at each point of $\mathcal{H}$. Then choosing past-pointed null vector field n on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle l,n\rangle = 1$ and $\langle n, E_I\rangle = 0$. It is easy to see that n is unique at each point of $\mathcal{H}$. For any $p \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique null geodesic γ with respect to n. The affine parameter of γ is r and $\gamma(0) = p$. One can extend coordinates (t, x^i) into spacetime by Lie dragging them along γ and (t, r, x^i) is a coordinates system near horizon. Similarly, one can also extend the null tetrad (l, n, E_I) into the spacetime by requiring $\nabla_n(l, n, E_I) = 0$. We call coordinates (t, r, x^i) as a Bondi-like coordinates near horizon $\mathcal{H}$ and above chosen tetrad as Bondi-like tetrad near horizon. With this choice of Bondi-like coordinates, the Bondi-like tetrad can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \partial_r, \\ l &= \partial_t + U\partial_r + X^i\partial_i, \\ E_I &= W_I\partial_r + e_I^i\partial_i, \qquad I, i = 1, 2, \cdots, p, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where (U, X^i, W_I, e_I^i) are functions of (t, r, x^i) and satisfy $U \hat{=} X^i \hat{=} W_I \hat{=} 0$. (Note: Here we follow the notation of ref.[18], " $\hat{=}$ " means equality holds only on horizon $\mathcal{H}$. In the following of this paper, we also use $\hat{f}$ to denote the value of function f on horizon.) Using the null tetrad, the metric can be expressed as $g^{ab} = l^a n^b + n^a l^b + E_I^a E_I^b$, then components of metric are :

$$(g^{\mu\nu}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \vec{0} \\ 1 & 2U + W_I W_I & X^i + W_I e_I^i \\ \vec{0} & X^j + W_I e_I^j & e_I^i e_I^j \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

With this Bondi gauge, it is also easy to see that following relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_I := -\langle l, \nabla_I n\rangle, \quad \pi_I := \langle E_I, \nabla_l n\rangle \\ &\alpha_I + \pi_I = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Based on the discussion of ref.[18, 19], π_I is related with the angular momentum of horizon. In this paper, we consider non-rotating black holes, so we require the non-rotating condition : $\pi_I \hat{=} 0$.

In order to get the behavior of metric near horizon, let's consider the Cartan structure equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
[n, E_I] &= \frac{\partial W_I}{\partial r}\partial_r + \frac{\partial e^i_I}{\partial r}\partial_i \\
&= \alpha_I \partial_r - \theta'_{JI}\left(W_J\partial_r + e^i_J\partial_i\right), \\
[n, l] &= \frac{\partial U}{\partial r}\partial_r + \frac{\partial X^i}{\partial r}\partial_i \\
&= \varepsilon\partial_r - \pi_I\left(W_I\partial_r + e^i_I\partial_i\right). \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

Above equations imply

$$\frac{\partial W_I}{\partial r} = \alpha_I - \theta'_{JI}W_J, \quad \frac{\partial e^i_I}{\partial r} = -\theta'_{JI}e^i_J, \quad \frac{\partial U}{\partial r} = \varepsilon - \pi_I W_I, \quad \frac{\partial X^i}{\partial r} = -\pi_I e^i_I, \quad (5)$$

where $\theta'_{JI} := \langle E_J, \nabla_I n\rangle, \varepsilon := \langle n, \nabla_l l\rangle$. Based on the discussion of ref.[18, 19], $\varepsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a constant and just the surface gravity of horizon $\mathcal{H}$. Combining with Eq.(2), we get the first order derivative of metric.

To control the order of the metric more accurately, the second derivation of metric are needed. Taking r-derivative on both sides of equations in (5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial r^2} &= \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial r} - \frac{\partial \pi_I}{\partial r}W_I - \pi_I\frac{\partial W_I}{\partial r}, \\
\frac{\partial^2 W_I}{\partial r^2} &= \frac{\partial \alpha_I}{\partial r} - \frac{\partial \theta'_{JI}}{\partial r}W_J - \theta'_{JI}\frac{\partial W_I}{\partial r}, \qquad (6) \\
\frac{\partial^2 X^i}{\partial r^2} &= -\frac{\partial \pi_I}{\partial r}e^i_I - \frac{\partial e^i_I}{\partial r}\pi_I,
\end{aligned}$$

so the values of $\partial_r\varepsilon, \partial_r\pi_I, \partial_r\alpha_I$ and $\partial_r\theta'_{JI}$ are needed. With the help of second Cartan structure equations,

$$\partial_r\varepsilon = \nabla_n\varepsilon = \nabla_n\langle n, \nabla_l l\rangle = R_{nlnl} - \alpha_I\pi_I. \qquad (7)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_r\pi_I &= R_{nlIn} - \theta'_{IJ}\pi_J, \\
\partial_r\alpha_I &= R_{nInl} - \alpha_J\theta'_{JI}, \\
\partial_r\theta'_{JI} &= R_{nIJn} - \theta'_{JK}\theta'_{KI}. \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these equations in to (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial r^2} &= R_{nlnl} - R_{nlIn}W_I - 2\alpha_I\pi_I + 2\theta'_{IJ}\pi_J W_I, \\
\frac{\partial^2 W_I}{\partial r^2} &= R_{nInl} - R_{nIJn}W_J - \alpha_J\left(\theta'_{JI} + \theta'_{IJ}\right) + W_J\theta'_{JK}\left(\theta'_{KI} + \theta'_{IK}\right), \\
\frac{\partial^2 X^i}{\partial r^2} &= -R_{nlIn}e^i_I + 2\theta'_{IJ}\pi_J e^i_I. \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

Using non-rotating condition $\pi_I \hat{=} 0$, all unknown functions near horizon are

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= \hat{\varepsilon} r + \frac{1}{2}\hat{R}_{nlnl} r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
W_I &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{R}_{nInl} r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
X^i &= \frac{1}{2}\hat{R}_{nInl}\hat{e}^i_I r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
e^i_J &= \hat{e}^i_J - \hat{\theta}'_{IJ}\hat{e}^i_I r + O(r^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Finally, the asymptotic extension of metric near horizon are

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{tr} &= 1, \qquad g^{ti} = 0, \\
g^{rr} &= 2U + \sum_I W_I^2 = 2\hat{\varepsilon} r + \hat{R}_{nlnl} r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
g^{ri} &= X^i + \sum_I W_I e^i_I = \hat{R}_{nInl} e^i_I r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
g^{ij} &= \sum_I e^i_I e^j_I \sim O\left(r^0\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{tt} &= -g^{rr} + g^{ri} g_{ij} g^{rj} = -2\hat{\varepsilon} r - \hat{R}_{nlnl} r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
g_{ti} &= -g_{ij} g^{rj} = -\hat{R}_{nInl}\hat{g}_{ij}\hat{e}^j_I r^2 + O\left(r^3\right), \\
g_{tr} &= 1, \qquad g_{ri} = 0, \qquad g_{ij} \sim O(r^0).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

3 The Petrov-like condition for non-rotating weakly isolated horizon

As firstly pointed out by Strominger et.al., the Petrov-like boundary condition plays an essential role in the construction of the gravity/fluid correspondence. The main reason is that imposing such a condition can guarantee that no outgoing gravitational radiation across the boundary[14]. Originally, the Petrov condition is proposed to classify the geometry of the whole spacetime. But here such conditions are only specified on the cutoff surface, thus one may call it Petrov-like boundary condition.

With previous result, for a cutoff surface $\Sigma_c := \{p \in M | r(p) = r_c\}$, the induced line element on Σ_c could be written as

$$ds^2_{p+1} = g_{tt} dt^2 + 2 g_{ti} dt dx^i + g_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \ (i, j = 1, ..., p). \tag{13}$$

The Petrov-like condition for gravity is defined by [14]

$$C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} l^\mu E^\nu_i l^\rho E^\sigma_j |_{\Sigma_c} = C_{lilj}|_{\Sigma_c} = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $C_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the Weyl tensor of space-time, l^μ and E^μ are the null tetrad as introduced in the previous section.

It has been shown in the last section that l^μ has the form $l = U\partial_r + \partial_t + X^i\partial_i$. From the normal covector $N_a = (dr)_a/\sqrt{g^{rr}}$ of Σ_c, one obtains

$$(\partial_r)^a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}N^a - \frac{1}{g^{rr}}(\partial_t)^a - \frac{g^{ri}}{g^{rr}}(\partial_i)^a .$$

Thus

$$l^a = \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}N^a + \left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)(\partial_t)^a + \left(X^i - \frac{Ug^{ri}}{g^{rr}}\right)(\partial_i)^a . \tag{15}$$

The Petrov-like condition could be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \left[\frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}C_{NiNj} + \left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2 C_{titj} + \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)(C_{Nitj} + C_{Njti})\right. \\ & + \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(X^k - \frac{Ug^{rk}}{g^{rr}}\right)(C_{Nikj} + C_{Njki}) \\ & + \left(X^k - \frac{Ug^{rk}}{g^{rr}}\right)\left(X^m - \frac{Ug^{rm}}{g^{rr}}\right)C_{kimj} \\ & \left. + \left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)\left(X^k - \frac{Ug^{rk}}{g^{rr}}\right)(C_{tikj} + C_{tjki})\right]_{\Sigma_c} . \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

It has been mentioned in the section of introduction, the intrinsic metric of the cutoff surface is fixed, only the extrinsic curvature is perturbed. So the relation between the spacetime Weyl tensor and the curvature of the cutoff surface is needed. In the absence of matter field, the spacetime Weyl tensor may be decomposed by the curvature of the cutoff surface.

$$\begin{aligned} C_{abcd} &= \bar{R}_{abcd} - K_{ac}K_{bd} + K_{ad}K_{bc}, \\ C_{abcN} &= D_aK_{bc} - D_bK_{ac}, \\ C_{aNbN} &= -\bar{R}_{ab} + KK_{ab} - K_{ac}K^c_b. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Here D is the induced connection on Σ_c and $\bar{R}_{abcd}$ is the associated Riemann curvature. Thus Eq.(16) can be expressed in terms of the intrinsic and extrinsic curvature of the cutoff surface.

In the original method proposed by Strominger[14], to get the fluid/gravity correspondence, one should consider the near horizon limit and non-relativistic limit. Such two limits can be implemented as following: introduce a rescalling parameter λ, define new time coordinate $\tau = 2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 t$ and choose $r_c = 2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2$, consider the limit $\lambda \to 0$, where $\hat{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the surface gravity which has been introduced in last section. In the following parts, we will consider the Petrov-like condition in such limits.

As a result of Eq.(10),

$$X^k - \frac{Ug^{rk}}{g^{rr}} \quad = \quad X^k - \frac{UX^k + UW_I e_I^k}{2U + W_I W_I} \sim O\left(r^3\right), \tag{18}$$

Eq.(16) has a simpler expression,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \quad = \quad & \frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\left(-\bar{R}_{ij} + KK_{ij} - K_{ic}K_j^c\right) + \left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2 \left(\bar{R}_{titj} - K_{tt}K_{ij} + K_{tj}K_{ti}\right) \\ & + \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)\left(2D_{(j}K_{i)t} - 2D_t K_{ij}\right) + O(\lambda^6). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The induced metric of Σ_c in new coordinate is

$$ds_{p+1}^2 = \frac{g_{tt}}{4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4}d\tau^2 + 2\frac{g_{ti}}{2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2}d\tau dx^i + g_{ij}dx^i dx^j. \tag{20}$$

In coordinate (τ, r, x^i), the Petrov-like condition (19) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \quad = \quad & \frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\left(KK_j^i - K_c^i K_j^c - \bar{R}_{kj}h^{ki}\right) \\ & + 4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2\left(\bar{R}_{\tau k \tau j}h^{ki} - K_{\tau\tau}K_j^i + K_{\tau j}K_\tau^i\right) \\ & + \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 h^{ki}\left(2D_{(j}K_{k)\tau} - 2D_\tau K_{kj}\right) + O(\lambda^6). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where D_i is the induced connection on Σ_c.

According to the fluid/gravity correspondence, the stress tensor of a gravity system corresponds to the energy-momentum tensor of a fluid. It is well known that for gravity such a stress tensor can be described by the Brown-York tensor t_{ab}

$$t_{ab} = Kh_{ab} - K_{ab}. \tag{22}$$

We remark that in the standard AdS/CFT framework, there should be a counterterm in addition to the bare Brown-York tensor. However, in our approach the counterterm will not affect the final result. A short argument is given in the section of Summary and Discussion. Here we just ignore it. Plugging into

Eq.(21), we get the Petrov-like conditions in terms of the stress tensor,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \quad = \quad & -\frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\bar{R}_{kj}h^{ki}+4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2\bar{R}_{\tau i\tau j}h^{ki}\\
& +\frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\left(-t^i_\tau t^\tau_j+\frac{t}{p}t^i_j-t^i_k t^k_j\right)\\
& -4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2\left[h_{\tau\tau}\left(\frac{t^2}{p^2}\delta^i_j-t^\tau_\tau\frac{t}{p}\delta^i_j-\frac{t}{p}t^i_j+t^\tau_\tau t^i_j-t^\tau_j t^i_\tau\right)\right.\\
& \quad\left.+h_{k\tau}\left(\frac{t}{p}t^i_\tau\delta^k_j-t^k_j t^i_\tau+\frac{t}{p}t^k_\tau\delta^i_j-t^k_\tau t^i_j\right)\right]\\
& +\frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2h^{ki}\left[-2h_{\tau\tau}D_{(j}t^\tau_{k)}+2h_{\tau m}\left(D_{(j}\frac{t}{p}\delta^m_{k)}-D_{(j}t^m_{k)}\right)\right.\\
& \quad\left.+2h_{k\tau}D_\tau t^\tau_j-2h_{km}D_\tau\left(\frac{t}{p}\delta^m_j-t^m_j\right)\right]+O(\lambda^6). \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have obtained the expression of Petrov-like boundary condition in terms of intrinsic geometry and extrinsic curvature of Σ_c. Such boundary condition will provide some restriction on the relation between the intrinsic geometry and extrinsic curvature of Σ_c. Based on the requirement of fluid/gravity correspondence, such boundary condition should also hold when gravitational perturbation is introduced. In order to get the concrete form of such restrictions, the λ-extension of right hand side of Eq.(23) is needed. In next subsection, we will analysis the λ-extension of Brown-York tensor, then get the λ-extension of terms in Eq.(23) which is associated with Brown-York tensor. In subsection 3.2, we will analysis the λ-extension of terms which contains intrinsic curvature. Combining these results, one can get the restrictions on perturbed Brown-York tensor which is caused by the Petrov-like boundary condition. In section 4, we will see such restriction will help us to get the dual Navier-Stocks equations.

3.1 The order of the Brown-York tensor and constraints for perturbation

First of all, the near horizon behavior of the extrinsic curvature is needed.

$$K_{ab}=\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_N h_{ab}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\Gamma^r_{ab}, \quad a,b=t,i \qquad (24)$$

where N^a and h_{ab} are the normal vector and the induced metric of Σ_c respectively. The components of N^a are

$$N^r=\sqrt{g^{rr}}\ , \quad N^t=\frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\ , \quad N^i=\frac{g^{ri}}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\ . \qquad (25)$$

With the help of Eq.(11) and (12), the near horizon behaviour of N^a is clear.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{g^{rr}} &= \sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon} r}\left(1+\frac{\hat{R}_{nlnl}}{4\hat{\varepsilon}}r+O(r^2)\right)=\left(2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda+4\hat{\varepsilon}^2 b\lambda^3\right)+O\left(\lambda^5\right), \\
g^{ri} &= \hat{R}_{nInl}e^i_I r^2+O\left(r^3\right)=4\hat{\varepsilon}^2 c^i\lambda^4+O\left(\lambda^6\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $b=\hat{R}_{nlnl}/4\hat{\varepsilon}$, $c^i=\hat{R}_{nInl}e^i_I$.

The induced metric is easy to work out,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h_{\tau\tau}=\frac{g_{tt}}{4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4}=-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}-\hat{R}_{lnln}+O\left(\lambda^2\right), \qquad h^{\tau\tau}=-\frac{\lambda^4}{g^{rr}}=-\lambda^2+O\left(\lambda^4\right); \\
& h_{\tau i}=\frac{g_{ti}}{2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2}\sim O\left(\lambda^2\right), \qquad h^{\tau i}=-2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2\frac{g^{ri}}{g^{rr}}\sim O\left(\lambda^4\right); \\
& h_{ij}=g_{ij}\sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), \qquad h^{ij}=g^{ij}-\frac{g^{ri}g^{rj}}{g^{rr}}=g^{ij}+O(\lambda^6).
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}
$$

For late use, $\partial_t h_{ij}$ need to be calculated out explicitly. From Eq.(5) and (11),

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{ij} &= \hat{g}^{ij}+2\hat{e}^i_I\widehat{(\partial_r e^j_I)}r+O\left(r^2\right) \\
&= \hat{g}^{ij}-2\hat{e}^i_I\hat{\theta}'_{JI}\hat{e}^j_J r+O\left(r^2\right), \\
g_{ij} &= \hat{g}_{ij}+\hat{g}_{ik}\hat{e}^k_I\hat{\theta}'_{JI}\hat{e}^k_J\hat{g}_{kj}r+O\left(r^2\right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

Weakly isolated horizon condition implies $\partial_t\hat{g}_{ij}=0$. Thus

$$
\partial_t g_{ij}=[2\hat{g}_{ik}(\partial_t\hat{e}^k_I)\hat{\theta}'_{JI}\hat{e}^m_J\hat{g}_{mj}+\hat{g}_{ik}\hat{e}^k_I(\partial_t\hat{\theta}'_{JI})\hat{e}^m_J\hat{g}_{mj}]r+O\left(r^2\right). \tag{28}
$$

We need the values of $\partial_t e^k_I$ and $\partial_t\theta'_{JI}$ on horizon. With the help of facts $X^j\mathrel{\hat{=}}U\mathrel{\hat{=}}W_I\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$, the commutator between l and E_I gives

$$
[l,E_I] \;\mathrel{\hat{=}}\; (\partial_t e^i_I)\partial_i. \tag{29}
$$

On the other hand,

$$
\begin{aligned}
[l,E_I] &= \nabla_l E_I-\nabla_I l \qquad\qquad (30)\\
&= -\pi_I l+\varepsilon_{JI}E_J-\alpha_I l-\theta_{JI}E_J.
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we use abbreviations $\varepsilon_{JI}=\langle E_J,\nabla_l E_I\rangle,\theta_{JI}=\langle E_J,\nabla_I l\rangle$. The fact that on horizon l is geodesic leads to $\langle l,\nabla_l E_I\rangle=-\langle E_I,\nabla_l l\rangle\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$. The Bondi gauge of the null tetrad and the fact that l is normal direction of horizon implies $\varepsilon_{IJ}\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$. For WIH condition $tr\theta\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$, it implies that $\theta_{IJ}\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$ by Raychaudhuri equation. Thus we get $[l,E_I]\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$ for non-rotating black hole. This implies that $\partial_t e^i_I\mathrel{\hat{=}}0$.

As for $\partial_t\theta'_{JI}$, consider the derivation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nabla_l\theta'_{JI} &= \nabla_l\langle E_J,\nabla_I n\rangle \\
&\mathrel{\hat{=}} R_{lIJn}-\varepsilon\theta'_{JI},
\end{aligned}
\tag{31}
$$

where the fact $\nabla_I \pi_J \hat{=} 0, \pi_J \hat{=} \alpha_I \hat{=} \theta_{JK} \hat{=} \varepsilon_{KI} \hat{=} 0$ and $U \hat{=} X^i \hat{=} 0$ are used. On the other hand, because of Eq.(1)

$$\nabla_l \theta'_{JI} \quad \hat{=} \quad \partial_t \theta'_{JI}. \tag{32}$$

Thus we have

$$\partial_t \theta'_{JI} \quad \hat{=} \quad R_{lIJn} - \varepsilon \theta'_{JI}. \tag{33}$$

Plugging into Eq.(28), we may deduce that

$$\partial_t g_{ij} = \hat{g}_{ik} \hat{e}^k_I (\partial_t \hat{\theta}'_{JI}) \hat{e}^m_J \hat{g}_{mj} 2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 + O(\lambda^4) \sim O(\lambda^2). \tag{34}$$

We also need the value of $\partial_r g_{ij}$. Because $g_{ik} g^{kj} = \delta^j_i$ and $g^{ij} = \sum e^i_I e^j_I$, it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r g_{ij} &= -g_{mi} (\partial_r e^m_I) e^k_I g_{kj} - g_{mj} (\partial_r e^m_I) e^k_I g_{ki} \\ &= 2 g_{mi} \theta'_{IJ} e^m_J e^k_I g_{kj} \sim O(\lambda^0). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

In the last step, Eq.(5) is used.

Based on these preparation, the near horizon extension of the extrinsic curvature are

$$\begin{aligned} K^i_j &= h^{\mu i} K_{\mu j} = h^{ki} K_{kj} + h^{ti} K_{tj} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} g^{ki} \left(\sqrt{g^{rr}} \partial_r g_{kj} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}} \partial_t g_{kj} \right) + O\left(\lambda^3\right) \\ &= \sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} \xi^i_j \lambda + O\left(\lambda^3\right) \sim O\left(\lambda\right). \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

$$K^\tau_i = 2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 K^t_i = \hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 (h^{tt} K_{ti} + h^{kt} K_{ki}) \sim O(\lambda^4) \tag{37}$$

$$\begin{aligned} K^\tau_\tau &= K^t_t = h^{tt} K_{tt} + h^{it} K_{it} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2g^{rr}} \left(\sqrt{g^{rr}} \partial_r g_{tt} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}} \partial_t g_{tt} + 2\partial_t \sqrt{g^{rr}} + 2 g_{tt} \partial_t \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}} \right) + O\left(\lambda^3\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda} + \beta\lambda + O\left(\lambda^3\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^{-1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned} K &= K^t_t + K^i_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda} + \sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} (\beta + \xi) \lambda + O\left(\lambda^3\right) \sim O(\frac{1}{\lambda}). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Here $\xi^i_j = \hat{g}^{ki} [\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\, \hat{\theta}'_{IJ} + (2\hat{\varepsilon})^{-1/2} \partial_t \hat{\theta}'_{IJ}] \hat{e}^I_k \hat{e}^J_j$ is the coefficient of the leading order of K^i_j, while β is the cofficient of the order $O\left(\lambda\right)$ in K^t_t and $\xi = \xi^i_i$.

We remark that Eq.(39) shows the mean curvature of Σ_c is $K \sim O(\frac{1}{\lambda})$, which is similar to the large mean curvature expansion obtained by Lysov and Strominger in Rindler case[14]. This means up to the order we will use LS's large mean curvature limit is equivalent to our near horizon limit.

Now let us introduce the gravitational perturbations. Based on main picture of AdS/CFT correspondence, the intrinsic geometry of boundary is fixed and the extrinsic curvature of boundary is perturbed. Obviously, perturbing the extrinsic curvature is equivalent to perturbing the Brown-York tensor. As done by [14], the concrete form of the perturbation is

$$t^a_b = {}^B t^a_b + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k, \tag{40}$$

where ${}^B t^a_b$ is the Brown-York tensor of back ground spacetime.

As stressed before, the Petrov-like boundary condition plays an extremely important rule in fluid/gravity correspondence. In terms of initial-boundary value problem of Einstein system[23], such boundary condition means there is no out-going gravitational radiation through boundary. Such boundary condition also should hold for perturbed spacetime and give some restrictions for the gravity perturbation. Let us consider the Petrov-like boundary condition for perturbed spacetime. Remember the near horizon behavior of K^a_b, i.e. Eq.(36)-(39), the perturbed Brown-York tensor is

$$\begin{aligned} t^\tau_i &= -K^\tau_i + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k \\ &= \lambda t^{\tau(1)}_i + O\left(\lambda^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t^\tau_\tau &= K - K^\tau_\tau + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k = K^i_i + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k \\ &= \left(\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\xi + t^{\tau(1)}_\tau\right)\lambda + O\left(\lambda^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t^i_j &= K\delta^i_j - K^i_j + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda}\delta^i_j + \left\{\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\,\left[(\beta+\xi)\delta^i_j - \xi^i_j\right] + t^{i(1)}_j\right\}\lambda + O\left(\lambda^2\right), \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t^i_\tau &= h^i_\mu h^\nu_\tau t^\mu_\nu = h^{\tau i}h_{\tau\tau}t^\tau_\tau + h^{\tau i}h_{j\tau}t^j_\tau + h^{ji}h_{\tau\tau}t^\tau_j + h^{ji}h_{m\tau}t^m_j \\ &= h^{ji}h_{\tau\tau}t^\tau_j + O(\lambda) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\lambda}h^{ij}t^{\tau(1)}_j + O(1), \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t &= pK + \sum_{k=1} t^{a(k)}_b \lambda^k \\ &= \frac{p}{2\lambda} + \left(p\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\,(\beta+\xi) + t^{(1)}\right)\lambda + O\left(\lambda^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Substituting these results into the Petrov-like condition (23), we want to show that $t^{i(1)}_j$ could be expressed in terms of $t^{\tau(1)}_i$. The coefficients of Eq.(23) are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U^2}{g^{rr}} &= \hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^2 + O\left(\lambda^4\right), \\ -\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2 4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4 &= -\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4 + O\left(\lambda^6\right), \\ \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)2\hat{\varepsilon}\lambda^2 &= \hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^3 + O\left(\lambda^5\right). \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The terms in parentheses of Eq.(23) which are related to the Brown-York tensor could be calculated straightly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -t^i_\tau t^\tau_j + \frac{t}{p} t^i_j - t^i_k t^k_j \\
= \quad & h^{ik} t^{\tau(1)}_k t^{\tau(1)}_j + \frac{1}{2}\left(-t^{i(1)}_j + \frac{t^{(1)}}{p}\delta^i_j\right) + \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{2}}\ \xi^i_j + O\left(\lambda\right), \\
& \frac{t^2}{p^2}\delta^i_j - t^\tau_\tau \frac{t}{p}\delta^i_j - \frac{t}{p} t^i_j + t^\tau_\tau t^i_j - t^\tau_j t^i_\tau \\
= \quad & \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{t^{(1)}}{p}\delta^i_j - t^{i(1)}_j\right) + \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{2}}\ \xi^i_j + h^{ik} t^{\tau(1)}_k t^{\tau(1)}_j + O\left(\lambda\right), \\
& \lambda^2 h_{k\tau}\left(\frac{t}{p} t^i_\tau \delta^k_j - t^k_j t^i_\tau - \frac{t}{p} t^k_\tau \delta^i_j + t^k_\tau t^i_j\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Then we consider the derivations $D_a t^b_c$. In order to do that, we need the connection coefficients $\bar{\Gamma}^a_{bc}$ on Σ_c. Since the induced metric on Σ_c is fixed, by definition, $\bar{\Gamma}^a_{bc} = \frac{1}{2}h^{ad}\left(h_{bd,c} + h_{cd,b} - h_{bc,d}\right)$. Straightforward calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} &= h^{\tau\tau} h_{\tau\tau,\tau} + O\left(\lambda^2\right) = \frac{1}{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\partial_t \hat{R}_{nlnl} + O(\lambda^2) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), \\
\bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{j\tau} &= \frac{1}{2} h^{\tau\tau} h_{\tau\tau,j} + O\left(\lambda^4\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^2\right), \\
\bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{ji} &= -\frac{1}{2} h^{\tau\tau} h_{ji,\tau} + O\left(\lambda^4\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^2\right), \\
\bar{\Gamma}^i_{\tau\tau} &= \frac{1}{2} h^{ik}\left(2h_{\tau k,\tau} - h_{\tau\tau,k}\right) + O\left(\lambda^2\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), \\
\bar{\Gamma}^m_{j\tau} &= \frac{1}{2} h^{mk} h_{jk,\tau} + O\left(\lambda^2\right) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{ji}\hat{e}^i_I(\partial_t \hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\hat{e}^m_J + O(\lambda^2) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), \\
\bar{\Gamma}^i_{jk} &= \frac{1}{2} h^{im}\left(h_{jm,k} + h_{km,j} - h_{jk,m}\right) + O\left(\lambda^4\right) \\
&= \tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} + O(\lambda^2) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}^i_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}^{im}(\hat{g}_{jm,k} + \hat{g}_{km,j} - \hat{g}_{jk,m})$ is the Christoffol symbol on the section S_t of horizon.

Based on these preparations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right) 2\varepsilon\lambda^2 h^{ki} 2h_{\tau\tau} D_{(j} t^\tau_{k)} = -2\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^2 h^{ki} D_{(j} t^{\tau(1)}_{k)} + O\left(\lambda^4\right), \\
& \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right) 2\varepsilon\lambda^2 h^{ki} 2h_{\tau m}\left(D_{(j}\frac{t}{p}\delta^m_{k)} - D_{(j} t^m_{k)}\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^4\right), \\
& \frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right) 2\varepsilon\lambda^2 h^{ki} 2h_{k\tau} D_\tau t^\tau_k \sim O\left(\lambda^4\right), \\
& -\frac{U}{\sqrt{g^{rr}}}\left(1 - \frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right) 2\varepsilon\lambda^2 h^{ki} 2h_{km} D_\tau\left(\frac{t}{p}\delta^m_j - t^m_j\right) \\
& \quad = O\left(\lambda^2\right) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Now most parts of Eq.(23) have been written out. Only two terms which are related to the intrinsic curvature are remained.

3.2 Order of the intrinsic curvature

In previous subsection, we calculate all terms in Eq.(23) which contains the perturbed Brown-York tensor. There still two terms left, i.e. the two terms in the first line of Eq.(23). Each of them contains Riemannian curvature of the boundary Σ_c. Now we consier these two terms

$$-\frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\bar{R}_{kj}h^{ki} + 4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2\bar{R}_{\tau i\tau j}h^{ki}. \tag{50}$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau j} &= h_{\mu j}\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau}{}^{\mu} = h_{\tau j}\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau}{}^{\tau} + h_{ij}\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau}{}^{i}, && (51)\\
\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau}{}^{\tau} &= \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau\tau,k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau k,\tau} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{\tau\tau}\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\mu k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{\tau k}\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau\mu}\\
&\sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), && (52)\\
\bar{R}_{\tau k\tau}{}^{i} &= \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\tau\tau,k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\tau k,\tau} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{\tau\tau}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\mu k} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{\tau k}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\tau\mu}\\
&= -\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\tau k,\tau} + O\left(\lambda^0\right)\\
&\sim O\left(\lambda^{-2}\right), && (53)
\end{aligned}$$

with Eq.(48),

$$4\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4\left(1-\frac{U}{g^{rr}}\right)^2\bar{R}_{\tau i\tau j}h^{ki} \sim O(\lambda^2). \tag{54}$$

For Ricci tensor of Σ_c,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}_{kj} &= \bar{R}_{k\mu j}{}^{\mu} = \bar{R}_{k\tau j}{}^{\tau} + \bar{R}_{kij}{}^{i}, && (55)\\
\bar{R}_{k\tau j}{}^{\tau} &= \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{kj,\tau} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau j,k} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{kj}\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\mu\tau} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{\tau j}\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{k\mu}\\
&= \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{kj,\tau} + O\left(\lambda^2\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\,(\partial_t^2\hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\hat{e}^J_j\hat{e}^I_k + O(\lambda^2)\\
&\sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), && (56)\\
\bar{R}_{kij}{}^{i} &= \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{kj,i} - \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{ij,k} + \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{kj}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{\mu i} - \bar{\Gamma}^{\mu}_{ij}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{k\mu}\\
&= \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{kj,i} - \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{ij,k} + \bar{\Gamma}^{m}_{kj}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{mi} - \bar{\Gamma}^{m}_{ij}\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{km} + O\left(\lambda^2\right)\\
&= \tilde{R}_{kj} + O\left(\lambda^2\right)\\
&\sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), && (57)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{R}^i_j$ is the Riemann curvature of S_t. It is obvious that $\tilde{R}_{kj} \sim O(\lambda^0)$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{U^2}{g^{rr}}\bar{R}_{kj}h^{ki} \\
= & -\left[\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^2 + \hat{R}_{nlnl}\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4 + O(\lambda^6)\right]\bar{R}_{kj}h^{ki} \\
= & -\left[\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^2 + \hat{R}_{nlnl}\hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^4 + O(\lambda^6)\right]\left[\frac{1}{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\,(\partial_t^2\hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\hat{e}_j^J\hat{e}_k^I + \tilde{R}_{kj} + O(\lambda^2)\right] \\
= & -\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{2}\,(\partial_t^2\hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\hat{e}_j^J\hat{e}_k^I\lambda^2 - \hat{\varepsilon}^2\lambda^2\tilde{R}_{kj} + O(\lambda^4) \qquad (58)
\end{aligned}$$

Besides, straight calculation also shows that

$$\left(-\lambda^2\bar{R}_{kj} + \lambda^4\bar{R}_{\tau i\tau j}\right)h^{ki} + \lambda^3 D_\tau\left(\frac{t}{p}\delta_j^i - t_j^i\right) = -\lambda^2\tilde{R}_j^i + O\left(\lambda^2\right) \qquad (59)$$

All the terms in Petrov-like condition has been worked out now. Combining these results together, the 0-order of Eq.(23) holds automatically because the background fulfills the Petrov-like condition. The 2-order term gives

$$t_j^{i(1)} = 2h^{ik}t_k^{\tau(1)}t_j^{\tau(1)} - 2h^{ik}\tilde{\nabla}_{(j}t_{k)}^{\tau(1)} + \frac{t^{(1)}}{p}\delta_j^i + \xi_j^i\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} - \tilde{R}_j^i. \qquad (60)$$

(Note : in above equation, the meaning of $\tilde{\nabla}_i t_j^{\tau(1)}$ is that we see $t_j^{\tau(1)}$ as an 1-form on S_t and take covariant derivative on that vector inside S_t.) Here we see that the Petrov-like boundary condition gives restriction for the perturbed Brown-York tensor, i.e. $t_j^{i(1)}$ are functions of $t_j^{i(1)}$ and other geometric quantities on horizon. This restriction is similar to what has been gotten by previous works for concrete space-time back ground[14, 15, 16, 17].

3.3 Gaussian Equation

Besides the Petrov-like boundary condition, there is another constrain equation on Σ_c, i.e. the Gaussian equation, which also can help us to restrict the freedom of perturbation of Brown-York tensor. The Gaussian equation for gravity takes the form

$$\bar{R} + K^{\mu\nu}K_{\mu\nu} - K^2 = 0.$$

In terms of the Brown-York tensor t_{ab}, it becomes

$$\bar{R} + (t_\tau^\tau)^2 - \frac{2h^{ij}}{\lambda^2}t_i^\tau t_j^\tau - \frac{t^2}{p} + t_j^i t_i^j = 0.$$

Expanding the scalar curvature $\bar{R}$ in terms of parameter λ near the horzion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R} &= \bar{R}_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} = \bar{R}_{\tau\tau}h^{\tau\tau} + 2\bar{R}_{\tau i}h^{\tau i} + \bar{R}_{ij}h^{ij} \\
&= -\frac{1}{2g_{tt}}h^{im}\partial_t\partial_t h_{im} + \tilde{R} + O(\lambda^2) \\
&\sim O(\lambda^0)
\end{aligned}$$

Then 0-order component of Gaussian equation gives

$$t_{\tau}^{\tau(1)} = \bar{R} - 2h^{ij} t_{i}^{\tau(1)} t_{j}^{\tau(1)} - \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\varepsilon}}{2}}\ \xi, \tag{61}$$

where ξ is a parameter introduced in Eq.(39). Similar to previous works, the Gaussian equation help us to fix the perturbation $t_{\tau}^{\tau(1)}$ in terms of $t_{j}^{\tau(1)}$ and horizon geometry. This equation could be viewed as the equation of state for dual fluid.

4 Navier-Stokes equation

In previous section, we have considered the large mean curvature extension of the Petrov-like boundary condition for general non-rotating black holes. Like the discussion by Lysov and Strominger[14], the Petrov-like condition reduces the degree of freedom of the gravity to those of a fluid. The remaining $p+2$ variables may be interpreted as the hydrodynamic variables of a fluid living on the boundary. The Gaussian equation for gravity then can be viewed as the equation of state. In this section, we consider the Codazzi equation on Σ_c and show it will lead to the Navier-Stokes equation at the large mean curvature limit.

The Codazzi equation in terms of Brown-York tensor is

$$D_a t_b^a = 0 \tag{62}$$

Because the background spacetime satisfies the Codazzi equation automatically, we only need to consider the equation for perturbation.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= D_a \sum_{k=1} t^{a\tau(k)}\lambda^k \\
&= \partial_\tau \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau\tau(k)}\lambda^k + \partial_i \sum_{k=1} t^{i\tau(k)}\lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau\tau(k)}\lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{i\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau\tau(k)}\lambda^k \\
&\quad + \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau i} \sum_{k=1} t^{i\tau(k)}\lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{ij} \sum_{k=1} t^{j\tau(k)}\lambda^k \\
&\quad + \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau\tau(k)}\lambda^k + 2\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau i} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau i(k)}\lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{ij} \sum_{k=1} t^{ij(k)}\lambda^k
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

With the help of Eq.(26), it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
t^{\tau\tau(1)} &= h^{\tau\tau} t_{\tau}^{\tau(1)} + h^{i\tau} t_{i}^{\tau(1)} \sim O\left(\lambda^2\right), \\
t^{i\tau(1)} &= h^{i\tau} t_{\tau}^{\tau(1)} + h^{ij} t_{j}^{\tau(1)} = h^{ij} t_{j}^{\tau(1)} + O(\lambda^4) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right), \\
t^{ij(1)} &= h^{i\tau} t_{\tau}^{j(1)} + h^{ik} t_{k}^{j(1)} = h^{ik} t_{k}^{j(1)} + O(\lambda^4) \sim O\left(\lambda^0\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Using Eq.(26) and (48),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D_a \sum_{k=1} t^{a\tau(k)} \lambda^k \\ &= \left[\tilde{\nabla}^j t_j^{\tau(1)} \right] \lambda + O(\lambda^2). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

Based on the basic identification[14],

$$2t_j^{\tau(1)} \leftrightarrow v_j, \qquad 2t^{(1)}/p \leftrightarrow P, \tag{66}$$

under the large mean curvature limit, the leading order of Eq.(65) implies $\tilde{\nabla}^i v_i = 0$, i.e. the incompressible condition.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D_a \sum_{k=1} t^{aj(k)} \lambda^k \\ &= \partial_\tau \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau j(k)} \lambda^k + \partial_i \sum_{k=1} t^{ij(k)} \lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau j(k)} \lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau j(k)} \lambda^k \\ &\quad + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau i} \sum_{k=1} t^{ij(k)} \lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{im} \sum_{k=1} t^{mj(k)} \lambda^k \\ &\quad + \bar{\Gamma}^j_{\tau\tau} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau\tau(k)} \lambda^k + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{\tau i} \sum_{k=1} t^{\tau i(k)} \lambda^k + \bar{\Gamma}^j_{mi} \sum_{k=1} t^{mi(k)} \lambda^k \\ &= [\partial_\tau(\hat{g}^{ji} t_i^{\tau(1)}) + \partial_i(\hat{g}^{ik} t_k^{j(1)}) + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} \\ &\qquad + \tilde{\Gamma}^i_{im} t^{mj(1)} + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} t^{i\tau(1)} + \tilde{\Gamma}^j_{mi} t^{mi(1)}]\lambda + O(\lambda^2) \\ &= [\hat{g}^{ji} \partial_\tau t_i^{\tau(1)} + \tilde{\nabla}^i (t_i^{j(1)}) + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} t^{i\tau(1)}]\lambda + O(\lambda^2) \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Using Eq.(60), above equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [\hat{g}^{ji} \partial_\tau t_i^{\tau(1)} + \tilde{\nabla}^i (t_i^{j(1)}) + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} t^{i\tau(1)}]\lambda + O(\lambda^2) \\ &= \left[\hat{g}^{ji} \partial_\tau t_i^{\tau(1)} + \tilde{\nabla}^i \left(2\hat{g}^{jk} t_k^{\tau(1)} t_i^{\tau(1)} - 2\hat{g}^{jk} \tilde{\nabla}_{(k} t_{i)}^{\tau(1)} + \frac{t^{(1)}}{p} \delta_i^j + \xi_i^j \sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} - \tilde{R}_i^j \right) \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} t^{i\tau(1)} \right] \lambda + O(\lambda^2) \\ &= \left[\hat{g}^{ji} \partial_\tau t_i^{\tau(1)} + 2t_i^{\tau(1)} \tilde{\nabla}^i (t^{j\tau(1)}) + 2t^{j\tau(1)} \tilde{\nabla}^i (t_i^{\tau(1)}) \right. \\ &\qquad - 2\tilde{\nabla}^i \hat{g}^{jk} \tilde{\nabla}_{(k} t_{i)}^{\tau(1)} + \tilde{\nabla}^i \left(\frac{t^{(1)}}{p} \delta_i^j \right) + \tilde{\nabla}^i (\xi_i^j \sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} - \tilde{R}_i^j) \\ &\qquad \left. + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} t^{j\tau(1)} + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} t^{i\tau(1)} \right] \lambda + O(\lambda^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then with Eq.(65) and (66), we get the leading order of above equation as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_\tau v^j + v^i \tilde{\nabla}_i v^j - \tilde{\triangle} v^j - \tilde{R}_i^j v^i + \tilde{\nabla}^j P + f^j \\ &\quad + \bar{\Gamma}^\tau_{\tau\tau} v^j + \bar{\Gamma}^i_{i\tau} v^j + 2\bar{\Gamma}^j_{i\tau} v^i \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where $f^j = \tilde{\nabla}^i(\xi_i^j\sqrt{2\hat{\varepsilon}} - \tilde{R}_i^j)$ only depends on the horizon geometry, so it can be seen as an external force caused by the curved space.

Remark : in Eq.(68), we get a generalized Navier-Stocks equation. The first line of eq.(68) is in the form of standard Navier-Stocks equation with external force. The problem is the extra terms in the second line. These terms are related with the Christoffel symbol on horizon. From eq.(48), it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Gamma}^{\tau}_{\tau\tau} &\hat{=} \frac{1}{2\hat{\varepsilon}}\partial_t \hat{R}_{nlnl}, \\
\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{j\tau} &\hat{=} \frac{1}{2}\hat{g}_{jk}\hat{e}^k_I(\partial_t\hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\hat{e}^i_J, \\
\bar{\Gamma}^{i}_{i\tau} &\hat{=} \frac{1}{2}\partial_t(\hat{\theta}'_{IJ})\delta^{IJ}. \qquad (69)
\end{aligned}$$

If the black hole is stationary, ∂_t is a Killing vector. Obviously, all these additional terms vanish, so we get the standard Navier-Stocks equation. This means that fluid/gravity correspondence exists for general non-rotating stationary black hole. Furthermore, simple calculation shows that these additional terms will be zero if ∂_t satisfies $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_t} g \sim O(r^2)$, so such correspondence also holds for asymptotic stationary black holes (Note: based on Eq.(28), $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_t} g_{ab} \sim O(r)$ for general WIH, so our asymptotic stationary condition $\mathcal{L}_{\partial_t} g \sim O(r^2)$ is not very restricted.). This result tells us that fluid/gravity correspondence can also exist in some dynamical cases. Another remark is about the external force term. In previous works[14, 9, 15, 16], all cases satisfy $\xi^i_j = 0$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_i \tilde{R}^i_j = 0$, so there are no external force term and our result agrees with previous results. For general horizon case, the inhomogeneity of the section of horizon will cause an external force term in the dual Navier-Stocks equation.

5 Summary and discussion

In this paper, we have proved that Lysov and Strominger's realization of the fluid/gravity correspondence exists for any non-rotating stationary isolated black-hole horizon. We have also found that such correspondence can be generalized to some non-stationary black holes. As discussed in the section of introduction, the Petrov-like boundary condition help us to reduce the degrees of freedom of gravity to that of fluid. Such condition also help us to deal with the compact horizon section cases without the use of the method of long wavelength expansion. From the viewpoint of initial-boundary value problem of Einstein equations, the Petrov-like boundary condition is also a quite natural choice. Based on the previous work [23], C_{lilj} is just the free boundary data of Einstein equations. This observation should be helpful for us to generalize the Petrov-like boundary condition to non-vacuum cases such as in Ref.[17], where some generalization for the Einstein-Maxwell case has been discussed.

As discussed in Ref.[17], when we talk the Brown-York tensor, there should be a counter term which depends only on the induced geometry of the boundary[21, 22] in addition to the extrinsic curvature terms. In our approach, the Navier-Stokes equation emerges from the conservation law on the boundary only at the perturbative level, while our boundary condition requires that the induced geometry should be fixed[14]. Therefore, the counterterm has no effect on the perturbations of the dual fluid on the boundary and we can ignore this term in the procedure.

In previous works [16, 17], there is an artificial coefficient α in the near horizon limit $r_c = \alpha^2\lambda^2$ as $\lambda \to 0$. The value of α has been chosen artificially in order to get the Navier-Stocks equation. In this paper, we have clarified that this coefficient is related to the surface gravity $\hat{\varepsilon}$ of the black hole as $\alpha^2 = 2\hat{\varepsilon}$.

Because of Eq.(17), the cases we considered is space-time without a cosmological constant. A little longer but quite similar calculation can show that the same result also holds for non-rotating weakly isolated horizon with a cosmological constant. The cosmological constant gives no contribution for the gravity/fluid correspondence. This also agrees with the previous work [16].

Non-vacuum cases, especially Einstein-Maxwell cases as well as Einstein-Maxwell-Scalar cases, are very interesting topic that will be considered in future works. Recently, such setups have been used to consider holographic magnetofluid[17] and holographic superfluid[24].

The non-rotating condition is crucial for our work. If we give up this condition, the dual equation will become very complex. For instance, the incompressible condition will lost. How to understand the gravity/fluid correspondence for rotating black holes is also an interesting open problem.

Another interesting problem is about the higher order gravity perturbation. In ref.[25], Compére et. al. found , in Minkowski case, there was a systematic way to construct such correspondence to any order gravity perturbation and to extract the physical properties of the dual fluid. With the help of long wavelength expansion, they found the dual fluid system satisfies a modified Navier-Stocks equations. This dual system is no longer incompressible and more complex. Interactions between shear, twist and expansion of fluid will appear in the modified Navier-Stocks equations. Some recent work[26] has considered the Petrov-like boundary condition for higher order perturbation in Minkowski case. The higher order LS's realization of the fluid/gravity correspondence in general spacetime will be considered in future work.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos.11175245, 11075206,11275208,11178002. Y.Ling also acknowledges the support from Jiangxi young scientists (JingGang Star) program and 555 talent project of Jiangxi Province.

References

[1] T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D 18**, 3598 (1978);
T. Damour, in: " Quelques propriétés mécaniques, électromagnétiques,

thermodynamiques et quantiques des trous noirs"; Thése de Doctorat dÉtat, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris VI, 1979;
T. Damour, " Surface effects in Black Hole Physics," in *Proceedings of the second Marcel Grossmann Meeting on general Relativity*, Ed. R.Ruffini, North-Holland, 1982.

[2] L. Smarr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**(1973)71;
D. J. E. Callaway, Phys. Rev. **E 53**(1996)3738.
M. Parikh and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D 58** (1998) 064011;
D. M. Eardley and S. B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. **D 66** (2002)044011.
V. Cardoso and O. J. C. Dias, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**(2006)181601.

[3] R. H. Price and K. S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. **D 33**, 915 (1986);
K. S. Thorne, R. H. Price and D. A. Macdonald, *Black Holes: the Membrane Paradigm*, New Haven, USA: Yale Univ. Pr. 1986.

[4] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 081601 ;
G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, JHEP 0209 (2002) 043.

[5] D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **57** (2007) 95.

[6] S. Bhattacharyya, V.E. Hubeny, S. Minwalla and M. Rangamani, JHEP 0802 (2008) 045 [arXiv:0712.2456];
S. Bhattacharyya, S. Minwalla and S.R. Wadia, JHEP 0908 (2009) 059 [arXiv:0810.1545].

[7] N. Iqbal and H. Liu, Phys. Rev. **D 79**(2009) 025023 [arXiv:0809.3808].

[8] I. Bredberg, C. Keeler, V. Lysov and A. Strominger, JHEP 1103 (2011) 141 [arXiv:1006.1902].

[9] I. Bredberg, C. Keeler, V. Lysov and A. Strominger, "From Navier-Stokes To Einstein", arXiv:1101.2451 [hep-th].

[10] R.-G. Cai, L. Li and Y.-L. Zhang, JHEP 1107 (2011) 027 [arXiv:1104.3281].

[11] C. Niu, Y. Tian, X.-N. Wu and Y. Ling, Phys. Lett. **B 711** (2012) 411 [arXiv:1107.1430].

[12] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, JHEP 10 (2003) 064 [arXiv:hep-th/0309213].

[13] C. Eling, I. Fouxon and Y. Oz, Phys. Lett. B **680** (2009) 496;
C. Eling and Y. Oz, JHEP 069(2010)1002;
C. Eling, Y. Neiman and Y. Oz, JHEP 110(2010)1010;
C. Eling and Y. Oz, JHEP 007(2011)1106.

[14] V. Lysov and A. Strominger, " From Petrov-Einstein to Navier-Stokes ", arXiv:1104.5502.

[15] T.-Z. Huang, Y. Ling, W.-J. Pan, Y. Tian and X.-N. Wu, J. High Energy Phys. **10** (2011) 079.

[16] T. Z. Huang, Y. Ling, W. J. Pan, Y. Tian and X. N. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D 85**, 123531 (2012).

[17] C.-Y. Zhang, Y. Ling, C. Niu, Y. Tian, and X.-N. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D 86**, 084043 (2012).

[18] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, Living Rev. Relativity **7** (2004) 10.

[19] M. Korzynski, J. Lewandowski and T. Pawlowski, Class.Quant.Grav. **22** (2005) 2001.

[20] H. Friedrich, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A 378** (1981) 169-184, 401-421.

[21] J. D. Brown and J.W. York, Phys. Rev. **D 47**, 1407 (1993).

[22] K. Skenderis, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 5849 (2002).

[23] H. Friedrich and G. Nagy, Commun. Math. Phys. **201**(1999)619;
H. O. Kreiss, O. Reula, O. Sarbach and J. Winicour, Commun. Math. Phys., **289**(2009)1099;
O. Sarbach and M. Tiglio, Living Rev. Relativity, **15**, (2012), 9. [Online Article]: http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2012-9

[24] A. Adams, P.M. Chesler and H. Liu, " Holographic Vortex Liquids and Superfluid Turbulence", arXiv:1212.0281

[25] G. Compére, P. McFadden, K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, JHEP **07** (2011) 050.

[26] R. G. Cai, L. Li, Q. Yang and Y. L. Zhang, " Petrov type I Condition and Dual Fluid Dynamics ", arXiv: 1302.2016.